

**REMARKS**

Applicants have amended the specification to correct a few minor typographical errors and claims 1, 13, 25, 49. and 51-53. Applicants not with appreciation the Office's indication that claims 38, 40 and 42 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form containing all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In view of these amendments and the following remarks, Applicants hereby request further examination and reconsideration of the application, and allowance of claims 1-54.

The Office has rejected claims 1-37, 39, 41, 43-54 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,263,351 B1 to Wolfe et al. ("Wolfe"). The Office asserts that Wolfe discloses selecting one of a plurality of stored electronic records search requests from a queued search database to execute next based upon one or more selection criteria at col. 11, line 50 to col. 12, line 53, col. 6, lines 32-52, col. 7, lines 19-63; executing the selected electronic records search request and retrieving at least one electronic record from at least one storage location during the executing at col. 6, lines 53-64, col. 8, lines 28-59; parsing the electronic records to convert one or more raw data sets into user selectable objects at col. 7, lines 20-63; and causing the user-selectable objects to be displayed at col. 7, lines 20-63.

Wolfe does not suggest or disclose, "selecting one of a plurality of user input, stored electronic records search requests from a queued search database to execute next based upon one or more selection criteria" as recited in claim 1, "the at least one processor executing a program of instructions for selecting one of a plurality of user input, stored electronic records search requests from a queued search database to execute next based upon one or more selection criteria" as recited in claim 13, "selecting one of a plurality of user input, stored electronic records search requests from a queued search database to execute next based upon one or more selection criteria" as recited in claim 25, "evaluating one or more user input, electronic records search requests using one or more search selection criteria . . . selecting one of the user input, electronic records search requests to execute next based upon the evaluation" as recited in claim 49, "evaluating one or more user input, electronic records search requests using one or more search selection criteria . . . selecting one of the user input, electronic records search requests to execute next based upon the evaluation" as recited in claim 51, "a search evaluation system that evaluates one or more user input, electronic records search requests using one or more search selection criteria . . . a search selection

system that selects one of the user input, electronic records search requests to execute next based upon the evaluation” as recited in claim 53.

The Office’s attention is respectfully directed to FIG. 11 and col. 11, lines 52-55 in Wolfe, which discloses that the user is monitored to determine if a list of citations is requested, however the citations that are displayed are not each input by a user requesting a search. Instead, as described in the background section of Wolfe, these citations are obtained for example by a search of a database, such as Lexis Nexis<sup>TM</sup>. As shown in FIGS. 3a and 3b and described at col. 5, line 66 to col. 6, lines 3 in Wolfe, citing case box 311 simply displays a list of subsequently decided cases to the case being displayed which as discussed above can be obtained by a database search.

The present invention provides a method and system for determining when to selectively execute user input stored search requests which are stored in a queue based on one or more selection criteria as discussed on page 4, lines 18-19 in the above-identified patent application. As discussed at page 18, lines 24-33 in the above-identified application, a variety of factors can effect and delay when a user input search request can be executed and the present invention uses one or more selection criteria to determine when one of a plurality of user input search requests should be executed. Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 13, 25, 49, 51, and 53. Since claims 2-12, 37, 43, and 46 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 1, claims 14-24, 39, 44, and 47 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 13, claims 26-36, 41, 45, and 48 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 25, claim 50 depends from and contains the limitations of claim 49, claim 52 depends from and contains the limitations of claim 51, and claim 54 depends from and contains the limitations of claim 53, they are distinguishable over the cited reference and are patentable in the same manner as claims 1, 13, 25, 49, 51, 53.

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 11, 2004

Gunnar G. Leinberg  
Gunnar G. Leinberg  
Registration No. 35,584

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
Clinton Square, P.O. Box 31051  
Rochester, New York 14603-1051  
Telephone: (585) 263-1014  
Facsimile: (585) 263-1600

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
- ☐ transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (703) \_\_\_\_\_.

November 11, 2004  
Date

Sherri A. Moscato  
Signature

Sherri A. Moscato  
Type or Print Name